

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-10 were pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. New claims 11-13 have been added. No claim has been canceled.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner argued that the scope of "an interface of a server" is unclear. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 1 to particularly point out and distinctly claim, in full, clear, concise and exact terms, the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment has overcome the rejection and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers et al. (U.S. Pub. 20010007086; hereinafter, "Rogers") in view of Paxhia et al. (U.S. Pub. 20020052935; hereinafter, "Paxhia") and Walls et al. (U.S. 6,348,933; hereinafter, "Walls"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 as amended sets forth that the global master, the local master, and the slave servers are programmed the same and configurable to different tasks, including automatically configurable as a master or a slave server *with respect to* a server to which the global master, local master, and slave servers are coupled to *based on the type of the server*. In contrast, none of Rogers, Paxhia, and Walls discloses such a limitation.

Regarding Rogers, the reference merely discloses a system having a number of servers. Rogers fails to disclose the configuration of the servers or how the servers are

configured (Rogers, Figure 6, paragraphs 53-55). Therefore, Rogers fails to disclose at least the limitation of claim 1 recited above.

As to Walls, the reference merely discloses that the functionality necessary for implementing the master server and slave servers may be embodied in a single software product, one copy of which would be installed in each of the hosts 300-308, and each installed copy would be configured to behave either as a master server or a slave server as appropriate (Walls, col. 5, lines 7-18). Walls does not disclose that the server is *automatically* configurable as a master or a slave server with respect to a server to which the global master, local master, and slave servers are coupled to based on the type of the server.

Likewise, Paxhia fails to disclose the limitation recited above because the servers in Paxhia have to be configured by a user (Paxhia, paragraphs 42, last sentence; paragraph 43, second sentence). According to Paxhia, a *user* has to be actively involved in configuring a server (Paxhia, paragraphs 52-56). Therefore, the servers in Paxhia are not automatically configurable. Furthermore, Paxhia does not disclose that the server is configurable as a master or a slave with respect to a second server coupled to the server based on the type of the second server. Rather, Paxhia merely discloses that a user determines the configuration of the server (Paxhia, paragraphs 48, 52-56).

Since a combination of Rogers, Paxhia, and Walls fails to disclose every limitation in claim 1 as amended, claim 1 is patentable over Rogers in view of Paxhia and Walls for at least this reason. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7 and 10 depend from claim 1, and thus, claims 2-7 and 10 are patentable over Rogers in view of Paxhia and Walls for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers, Paxhia, and Walls, and further in view of Saitoh et al. (U.S. 6,038,486; hereinafter, "Saitoh"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. For the reasons

discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 8-9 are patentable over Rogers in view of Paxhia, Walls, and Saitoh because Saitoh fails to make up the deficiencies of Rogers, Paxhia, and Walls. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claims 11-13 have been added without introducing any new matter. It is respectfully submitted that claims 11-13 are not anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Rogers, Paxhia, or Walls. Allowance of claims 11-13 is earnestly solicited.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks. Withdrawal of these objections and rejections is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that claims 1-10 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 12/15, 2003

C7  
Chui-Kiu Teresa Wong  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 12-15-03.

Esther Campbell 12-15-03  
Esther Campbell Date